


Case Clip(s) Detailed Report
 Tuesday, November 10, 2009, 5:56:53 PM

Fair Isaac v Experian et al

 **Williams, Kerry (Vol. 01) - 06/30/2008**

1 CLIP (RUNNING 00:11:38.035)

 Please state your full name for the record. ...

WILLIAMS **29 SEGMENTS (RUNNING 00:11:38.035)**



1. PAGE 7:18 TO 7:19 (RUNNING 00:00:03.933)

18 Q Please state your full name for the record.
 19 A Kerry Lee Williams.

2. PAGE 8:19 TO 9:02 (RUNNING 00:00:25.467)

19 Q Who are you employed by, sir?
 20 A Experian.
 21 Q How long has that been?
 22 A Since January of 2003.
 23 Q What position do you hold?
 24 A I'm group president of credit services and
 25 decision analytics in North America.
 00009:01 Q How long have you held that position?
 02 A Since the Summer of 2005.

3. PAGE 14:07 TO 14:10 (RUNNING 00:00:14.067)

07 Q So in January 2003, what position did you take
 08 on at Experian, sir?
 09 A I was the national sales manager of the
 10 consumer information services business.

4. PAGE 14:13 TO 15:09 (RUNNING 00:01:10.733)

13 Q How long did you hold the national sales
 14 manager position?
 15 A Uh, I believe I held that until approximately
 16 July or August of 2004.
 17 Q And since July of 2004, have you been the group
 18 president of Experian then?
 19 A I have not.
 20 Q Okay. What happened in July or August of 2004,
 21 what position did you take?
 22 A I was promoted to lead the consumer information
 23 services business.
 24 Q What was your actual position?
 25 A President.
 00015:01 Q And how long did you hold that position?
 02 A Until approximately June of 2005, give or take
 03 a month on either side of that.
 04 Q What position did you take over in June of
 05 2005?
 06 A I then was promoted to group president of
 07 credit services and decision analytics.
 08 Q Your present position?
 09 A Essentially, yes.

5. PAGE 210:25 TO 212:01 (RUNNING 00:01:31.667)

25 Q You mentioned earlier how you met John Dryzyk;
 00211:01 do you recall that?
 02 A I do.
 03 Q John Dursek's group at Mercer, Oliver & Wyman
 04 was hired to work on the project Trident development,
 05 correct?
 06 A I didn't really deal with John Dryzyk on that,
 07 but Mercer, Oliver, Wyman was hired, yes.

Case Clip(s) Detailed Report
 Tuesday, November 10, 2009, 5:56:53 PM

Fair Isaac v Experian et al

08 Q Weren't you the one to suggest that Mercer,
 09 Oliver, Wyman be hired?
 10 A Yes. Yes, absolutely.
 11 Q And you called John Dryzyk?
 12 A I did.
 13 Q And you thought of hiring Mercer, Oliver &
 14 Wyman for what reason?
 15 A So they would be able to play referee amongst
 16 the three credit bureaus, because we were going to put
 17 some really smart, talented, professorial, analytical
 18 type people together, and they were each going to have
 19 their own preferences on how to build the model.
 20 Because they're all experts in building models, quite
 21 knowledgeable.
 22 And instead of it turning into any type of
 23 rancorous situation, I wanted to make sure there was a
 24 really smart group providing oversight and in a position
 25 to break any ties if the three bureaus couldn't agree on
 00212:01 a particular course of action.

6. PAGE 212:02 TO 212:05 (RUNNING 00:00:13.767)

02 Q Did you understand that Mercer, Oliver & Wyman
 03 was to be hired to have some documentation role in terms
 04 of documenting what the decision process was during
 05 project Trident?

7. PAGE 212:07 TO 212:09 (RUNNING 00:00:09.166)

07 THE WITNESS: My primary reason for wanting
 08 them hired is as I stated, which is to be able to play
 09 referee.

8. PAGE 214:21 TO 214:23 (RUNNING 00:00:13.333)

21 Q Now, you spoke in detail with John Dryzyk on
 22 February 28, 2005, on what you were trying to accomplish
 23 with project Trident, right?

9. PAGE 215:04 TO 215:08 (RUNNING 00:00:17.000)

04 A I remember my phone conversation lasting, you
 05 know, a couple of minutes with John explaining what we
 06 were trying to do and him saying yeah, Oliver, Wyman
 07 should be able to help us and referring me over to
 08 Peter.

10. PAGE 217:19 TO 218:02 (RUNNING 00:00:23.733)

19 MR. BEEHLER: I'm done with that exhibit. I'm
 20 handing you what's been previously marked as Exhibit 70,
 21 Mr. Williams.
 22 BY MR. BEEHLER:
 23 Q Do you see the front page of that document is
 24 dated March 31, 2005, and it says it's a proposal to
 25 help the three major US credit bureaus develop a tri
 00218:01 bureau score card; do you see that?
 02 A I do.

11. PAGE 218:04 TO 218:08 (RUNNING 00:00:10.000)

04 Do you see that is a redlined version of the
 05 proposal?
 06 A Uh-huh.
 07 Q Correct? I need audible.
 08 A Yes. Sorry.

12. PAGE 219:19 TO 220:05 (RUNNING 00:00:39.000)

19 Q And there's an Experian comment in terms of

Case Clip(s) Detailed Report
 Tuesday, November 10, 2009, 5:56:53 PM

Fair Isaac v Experian et al

20 what the tri bureau score could be developed as in terms
 21 of what it was going to predict; do you see the Experian
 22 comment there?
 23 A I do.
 24 Q In reading over to the next page, 237, on
 25 Exhibit 70, it says simplify wording, mirror FICO for
 00220:01 ease of adoption or as agreed by team; do you see that,
 02 sir?
 03 A I do.
 04 Q What did mirror FICO for ease of adoption mean?
 05 A I'm not sure. I didn't write that.

13. PAGE 220:06 TO 220:13 (RUNNING 00:00:23.267)

06 Q Were you part of putting these comments
 07 together from Experian's standpoint?
 08 A No. As I said earlier, I contributed my 2
 09 cents worth, but I did not compile all of the comments
 10 and send them back to Oliver, Wyman.
 11 Q You were at a meeting where this document was
 12 discussed between the three credit bureaus on Oliver,
 13 Wyman; is that true?

14. PAGE 220:15 TO 220:18 (RUNNING 00:00:10.200)

15 THE WITNESS: I can't recall if it was a
 16 meeting or a phone call. Or if this document was
 17 actually discussed even in its current form in a
 18 meeting.

15. PAGE 220:20 TO 220:21 (RUNNING 00:00:11.967)

20 Q Who gave approval for the document to be sent
 21 out with Experian's comments as such, from Experian?

16. PAGE 220:25 TO 221:11 (RUNNING 00:00:32.200)

25 THE WITNESS: Jason would have given an
 00221:01 approval.
 02 BY MR. BEEHLER:
 03 Q Okay. Do you see the reference to calibrate to
 04 FICO on that same page 237 of Exhibit 70?
 05 A As a question I see it, yes, calibrate to FICO
 06 question mark.
 07 Q And Experian's comment, you see where it says
 08 while it would not be precisely aligned to the FICO
 09 score, it would be similar to promote acceptance and
 10 ease of use; do you see that, sir?
 11 A I do see that.

17. PAGE 221:18 TO 221:23 (RUNNING 00:00:19.033)

18 Q Do you have an understanding of what this
 19 meant?
 20 A I actually, at that time, would not have been
 21 able to tell you what the FICO score range was. So I
 22 would say I was not an expert in that and I couldn't
 23 give you a good understanding of it.

18. PAGE 223:14 TO 223:21 (RUNNING 00:00:21.800)

14 Q Turn to page 242, sir. Do you see the heading
 15 methodology plan?
 16 A I do.
 17 Q There's a reference to defining the dependent
 18 variable; do you see that, sir?
 19 A I do.
 20 Q Do you know what that refers to, generally?
 21 A I do not.

Case Clip(s) Detailed Report
Tuesday, November 10, 2009, 5:56:53 PM

Fair Isaac v Experian et al

19. PAGE 223:22 TO 224:06 (RUNNING 00:00:36.000)

22 Q Do you see the Experian comment to that first
23 bullet point down on the bottom of page 242 where it
24 says bullet one is done if we are mimicking FICO, but
25 need to discuss issues with trade level dependent flags;
00224:01 do you see that sir?
02 A I see that.
03 Q Do you know whether, in fact, the dependent
04 variable was -- did mimic FICO as it came out?
05 A I don't know what a dependent variable is. I
06 did flunk statistics once. Honest.

20. PAGE 242:21 TO 243:09 (RUNNING 00:00:35.300)

21 Q Handing you what's been marked as Exhibit 399,
22 do you see that's an e-mail from you to others dated
23 October 20, 2005?
24 A Yes.
25 Q And you state here that the three credit
00243:01 bureaus agree to a 001 to 999 normally distributed
02 scale, don't you?
03 A Yeah.
04 Q Is that your recollection that that had
05 occurred as of October 20, 2005?
06 A Yes.
07 Q Ultimately, a normally distributed scale was
08 not what VantageScore used, correct?
09 A Correct.

21. PAGE 243:12 TO 243:16 (RUNNING 00:00:14.167)

12 Q Use a log odd scale, didn't you?
13 A I'm not sure exactly what the scale is.
14 Q And it certainly didn't use a 001 to 999 score
15 range, did it?
16 A It did not use that score range.

22. PAGE 243:22 TO 243:25 (RUNNING 00:00:10.934)

22 Q What was the final score range that
23 VantageScore ultimately uses?
24 A It's a good question. I couldn't tell you
25 without going to the website and looking it up.

23. PAGE 244:13 TO 245:01 (RUNNING 00:00:48.667)

13 Q Handing you what's been marked as Exhibit 400.
14 Do you see that it's entitled Potentially Interesting
15 VantageScore Development Notes; do you see that, sir?
16 A Oh, yes, I do. Sorry.
17 Q You were the custodian of this document. You
18 want to take moment and look for it? I'm just
19 wondering, is this from Matt Schwab?
20 A I can't just take a single page and tell you
21 who the author is from.
22 Q Okay. Do you see on the -- about the middle of
23 the page there's a reference to a debate on the two
24 ranges between 401 to 990 and 501 to 990 and ultimately
25 they had to flip a coin?
00245:01 A I see that.

24. PAGE 245:02 TO 245:05 (RUNNING 00:00:10.133)

02 Q Does that bring back any resemblance of a
03 memory on that occurring?
04 A It doesn't. I wasn't -- I wasn't in
05 attendance, if this is what happened.

Case Clip(s) Detailed Report
Tuesday, November 10, 2009, 5:56:53 PM

Fair Isaac v Experian et al

25. PAGE 245:06 TO 245:09 (RUNNING 00:00:18.300)

06 Q How did it happen, sir, that the score went
07 from where you said it was agreed to from a 1 to 990
08 normally distributed scale, that's what it ultimately
09 arrived at, how did that change occur?

26. PAGE 245:11 TO 245:22 (RUNNING 00:00:40.667)

11 THE WITNESS: The -- you know, the analytical
12 team that continued to work on the project started --
13 tried to take that guidance to do it from 1 to 999 and
14 make it work in terms of the distributions. And they
15 found that to be a little unwieldy. And they wanted to
16 be able to use a different score range. And so they --
17 they went with something that worked better for the
18 VantageScore algorithm.
19 BY MR. BEEHLER:
20 Q I take you at your word that you're not a
21 statistics expert.
22 A I am not.

27. PAGE 246:02 TO 246:04 (RUNNING 00:00:08.167)

02 Is it your understanding a score range is
03 completely cosmetic, it can be drawn to any range in
04 terms of an algorithm?

28. PAGE 246:06 TO 246:11 (RUNNING 00:00:16.233)

06 THE WITNESS: It would seem that you could
07 create a score range in a variety of ways.
08 BY MR. BEEHLER:
09 Q Can you explain for us, then, your
10 understanding of what was unwieldy such that the 1 to
11 999 range was rejected?

29. PAGE 246:19 TO 246:20 (RUNNING 00:00:09.134)

19 THE WITNESS: I couldn't tell you why they were
20 so disenchanted with a 1 to 990.

TOTAL: 1 CLIP FROM 1 DEPOSITION (RUNNING 00:11:38.035)